

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the subject application as amended herein is respectfully requested. The Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended during the interview of January 19, 2005.

The Examiner has objected to the use of the term "clutch" in the claims. In response, the claims have been amended to refer to a pulley instead.

The Examiner has further indicated that in his view the limitation of claims 4 and 12 regarding angularly offset teeth is not disclosed. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The Examiner's attention is drawn to Figs. 5A and 5B which clearly show two sets of teeth that are axially disposed on the surface 46, with the teeth of one set being angularly offset from the teeth of the second set. This feature is also described in the specification at page 7, second full paragraph.

Claim 9 has been corrected to overcome the Examiner's objection.

Claim 15 has been amended to dependent on claim 7 and thereby provide proper antecedent basis for "the frame" element. The Examiner has also objected to the use of the term "cantilevered" with reference to the projections of claim 15. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. As described in the specification at the bottom of page 6 and top of page 7, tooth 48 or 50 has a frame 58 and a projection 60 that is suspended from the frame and flexes with respect to the frame and the cylindrical wall 46. Thus, the projections 60 are arranged and supported in a similar manner to a springboard extending over a pool. It is respectfully submitted that both projections 60 and a springboard are correctly characterized as being cantilevered.

Claims 16 and 17 have been amended to overcome the objections of the Examiner.

Claim 17 has been rejected as being anticipated by Jelic. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. As indicated in Fig. 2B, the bottom wall 30 has two lateral portions 30A, 30B and a central portion 30C that has a width that is less than the distance between the side walls 24, 26. This feature is not disclosed in Jelic and accordingly Jelic does not anticipate this claim. Claim 18 includes the recitation that the center portion of the bottom is lower than the side portions. This feature is also missing from Jelic.

Claims 1-6, 10-14 and 16 stand rejected as being obvious over Jelic in view of Baville. As recited in all these claims, a feature of the present invention is that the pulley is provided with that are integral with the pulley and have a flexible integral projection.

Jelic discloses an apparatus with protrusions 66 engaging a cord 72. Jelic is silent as to the physical characteristics of these protrusions and therefore it must be assumed that they are rigid. Obviously, a rigid protrusion is not as effective at generating an interference fit, then the flexible projections defined by the claims.

Baville discloses a pulley with a plurality of annular flanges made with dovetailed annular grooves. Annular ribs b made of rubber or leather are fitted into the grooves. The ribs can be replaced when they wear out.

Thus the combination of Jelic and Baville teaches that it is advantageous to provide a pulley with teeth having replaceable annular or ring-shaped rubber ribs. However, that is not the present invention. The present invention requires teeth with

flexible projections. There are several important differences between the combination of Baville and Jelic and the present invention. First, in the present invention, the projections are integral with the teeth. In the combination, the ribs are removable. Second, each tooth is provided with a single projection, in the combination, a plurality of teeth are provided with a single continuous rib. Third, the projection whole projection moves or bends as the cord is introduced into or removed from the channel between the teeth. The ribs of the combination do not flex or bend but are merely distorted or compressed as the cord is inserted or removed. Fourth, the annular ribs cannot be used to generate a serpentine channel.

Accordingly it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is patentably distinguishable over the prior art of record and therefore it should be allowed

Respectfully submitted,

GOTTLIEB, RACKMAN & REISMAN, P.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)  
270 Madison Avenue, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
(212) 684-3900



Tiberiu Weisz  
Reg. No. 29,876

Date: January 21, 2005